

**REMARKS**

The foregoing amendment amends claims 1, 12 and 16. Claim 1 is amended to recite “the LBS wireless network analysis program indicates with a first color the information of the GPS satellite which the position determination server provides for the mobile communication terminal and with a second color different from the first color the information of the GPS satellite which the mobile communication terminal actually acquires.” Claims 12 and 16 have also been amended to recite like features. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, at page 13, lines 12-20. No new matter is added. Applicants respectfully request that the foregoing amendment be entered and considered.

Claims 1-22 and 24-36 are pending in the instant application, of which claims 1, 12 and 16 are independent claims. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims define over the prior art of record.

**I. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-6, 9-12, 14-32 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1, 3-6, 9-12, 14-32 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,650,902 B1 (hereinafter “Richton”) in view of US 2004/0019676 A1 (hereinafter “Iwatsuki”) and further in view of US 2004/0193373 A1 (hereinafter “Beauregard”). (Office Action, page 2). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

**A. Independent Claim 1**

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Richton, Iwatsuki and Beauregard fails to disclose or suggest at least the following feature of claim 1: *the LBS wireless network analysis program indicates with a first color the information of the GPS satellite which the position determination server provides for the mobile communication terminal and with a second color different from the first color the information of the GPS satellite which the mobile communication terminal actually acquires.*

Richton describes a wireless telecommunications system using location or position information of a wireless mobile unit to initiate the sending of location-specific information to travelers. (Richton, Abstract). Richton also describes that information, such as airline arrival information, is retrieved and sent to the wireless mobile unit of the traveler. (Richton, Abstract).

Richton, however, does not disclose or suggest that *the LBS wireless network analysis program indicates with a first color the information of the GPS satellite which the position determination server provides for the mobile communication terminal and with a second color different from the first color the information of the GPS satellite which the mobile communication terminal actually acquires*, as recited in claim 1. There is no disclosure in Richton that the information on a GPS satellite is displayed with different colors.

Iwatsuki describes a network operation monitoring system that stores network status information in a time series with respect to each operation performed by an operator on a network. (Iwatsu, abstract). Iwatsuki also describes that the network status information is displayed in the time-dependant manner according to the operator's instruction. (Iwatsu, abstract). Iwatsuki, however, does not disclose or suggest that *the LBS wireless network analysis program indicates with a first color the information of the GPS satellite which the position determination server provides for the mobile communication terminal and with a second color different from the first color the information of the GPS satellite which the mobile communication terminal actually acquires*, as recited in claim 1. Iwatsuki is silent about displaying information on a GPS satellite with different colors.

Beauregard describes monitoring a constellation of Global Positioning System (GPS) satellites using a plurality of GPS receivers installed on the GPS satellites. In Figure 1, Beauregard depicts a space view of the constellation (12) of GPS satellites (14) where each orbit has four satellites (14) per plane. Beauregard, however, does not disclose or suggest that *the LBS wireless network analysis program indicates with a first color the information of the GPS satellite which the position determination server provides for the mobile communication terminal and with a second color different from the first color the information of the GPS satellite which the mobile communication terminal actually acquires*, as recited in claim 1. There is no disclosure in Beauregard of displaying the information on a GPS satellite with different color.

In view of at least reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Richton, Iwatsuki and Beauregard fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

**B. Dependent Claims 3-6 and 9-11**

Claims 3-6 and 9-11 depend from claim 1 and, as such, incorporate the subject matter of claim 1. For at least the reasons set forth above regarding claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 3-6 and 9-11 be withdrawn.

**C. Independent Claim 12**

Applicants submit that the combination of Richton, Iwatsuki and Beauregard fails to disclose or suggest at least the following feature of claim 12: *the information of the GPS satellite which the position determination server provides for the mobile communication terminal is indicated with a first color and the information of the GPS satellite which the mobile communication terminal actually acquires is indicated with a second color different from the first color.*

As discussed above regarding claim 1, the combination of Richton, Iwatsuki and Beauregard does not teach or suggest the above feature of claim 12. For at least reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Richton, Iwatsuki and Beauregard fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claim 12. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn.

**D. Dependent Claims 14-15**

Claims 14-15 depend from claim 12 and, as such, incorporate the subject matter of claim 12. For at least the reasons set forth above regarding claim 12, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 14-15 be withdrawn.

**E. Independent Claim 16**

Applicants submit that the combination of Richton, Iwatsuki and Beauregard fails to disclose at least the following feature of claim 16: *the LBS wireless network analysis program indicates with a first color the information of the GPS satellite which a position determination server provides for a mobile communication terminal and with a second color different from the first color the information of the GPS satellite which the mobile communication terminal actually acquires.*

As discussed above regarding claim 1, the combination of Richton, Iwatsuki and Beauregard does not teach or suggest the above feature of claim 16. For at least reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Richton, Iwatsuki and Beauregard fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claim 16. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 16 be withdrawn.

**F. Dependent claims 17-32 and 36**

Claims 17-32 and 36 depend from claim 16 and, as such, incorporate the subject matter of claim 16. For at least the reasons set forth above regarding claim 16, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 17-32 and 36 be withdrawn.

**II. Rejection of Claims 2, 7-8, 13 and 33-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 2, 7-8, 13 and 33-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Richton in view of Iwatsuki and Beauregard and further in view of well prior art. (Office Action, page 8). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

**A. Dependent Claims 2, 7-8 and 34-35**

Claims 2, 7-8 and 34-35 depend from claim 1 and, as such, incorporate the subject matter of claim 1.

Applicants submit that the combination of Richton, Iwatsuki, Beauregard and well-known prior art fails to disclose or suggest at least the following feature of claim 1: *the LBS wireless network analysis program indicates with a first color the information of the GPS satellite which the position determination server provides for the mobile communication terminal and with a second color different from the first color the information of the GPS satellite which the mobile communication terminal actually acquires*. The well-known prior art does not teach or suggest the above feature of claim 1. Claims 2, 7-8 and 34-35, which depend from claim 1, are not rendered unpatentable over Richton, Iwatsuki, Beauregard and well-known prior art. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 2, 7-8 and 34-35 be withdrawn.

**B. Dependent Claim 13**

Claim 13 depends from claim 12 and, as such, incorporates the subject matter of claim 12.

Applicants submit that combination of Richton, Iwatsuki, Beauregard and well-known prior art fails to disclose or suggest at least the following feature of claim 12: *the information of the GPS satellite which the position determination server provides for the mobile communication terminal is indicated with a first color and the information of the GPS satellite which the mobile communication terminal actually acquires is indicated with a second color different from the first color.* The well-known prior art does not teach the above feature of claim 12. Claim 13, which depends from claim 12, is not rendered unpatentable over Richton, Iwatsuki, Beauregard and well-known prior art. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 13 be withdrawn.

**C. Dependent Claim 33**

Claim 33 depends from claim 16 and, as such, incorporates the subject matter of claim 16.

Applicants submit that combination of Richton, Iwatsuki, Beauregard and well-known prior art fails to disclose or suggest at least the following feature of claim 16: *the LBS wireless network analysis program indicates with a first color the information of the GPS satellite which a position determination server provides for a mobile communication terminal and with a second color different from the first color the information of the GPS satellite which the mobile communication terminal actually acquires.* The well-known prior art does not teach or suggest the above feature of claim 16. Claim 33, which depends from claim 16, is not rendered unpatentable over Richton, Iwatsuki, Beauregard and well-known prior art. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claim 33 be withdrawn.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: May 23, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /EuiHoon Lee/  
Registration No.: 62375  
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP  
One Post Office Square  
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127  
(617) 227-7400  
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)  
Attorney/Agent For Applicant